

The influence of a foreign accent on moral decision making

Wies Achtereekte, S4796519

MA thesis

June 21st, 2021

First reader: Susanne Brouwer

Second reader: Louis ten Bosch

ENGELSE TAAL EN CULTUUR

Teacher who will receive this document: S. Brouwer and L. ten Bosch

Title of document: The influence of accent on moral decision making

Name of course: MA thesis General Linguistics

Date of submission: June 21st, 2021

The work submitted here is the sole responsibility of the undersigned, who has neither committed plagiarism nor colluded in its production.

Signed

Name of student: Wies Achtereekte

Abstract

This study investigated whether Turkish-accented Dutch influenced native Dutch listeners' decision making on auditory moral dilemmas. 93 Participants filled in an online questionnaire in which they were asked to listen and respond to ten moral dilemmas, either in native or accented Dutch. In particular, moral decisions were compared between a strong Turkish accent, a mild Turkish accent, and a Dutch native condition. Participants could choose between a 'yes' (utilitarian) or a 'no' (deontological) response, relating to whether or not they would execute the act discussed in the moral dilemma. It was hypothesized that participants would respond more utilitarian in the strong accent than in mild accent condition, and more utilitarian in the mild accent condition than in the native speaker condition. Results showed no significant difference between the conditions which means there was no effect of accent on moral decision making. These findings provide new insights into the role of accent in moral judgments, as well as the relationship between processing and accent.

Key words: *Moral decision making, foreign accent, Dutch*

Table of contents

Abstract 3

Introduction 5

The current study 9

Method..... 10

Participants 10

Speakers..... 10

Materials..... 11

Procedure 12

Design and analysis..... 12

Discussion 13

References 17

Appendix A: Materials pre-test 20

Appendix B: Dilemmas in English and Dutch 21

Introduction

In a globalized world, more and more people speak another language, or multiple languages, in addition to their native language. With an increasing amount of foreign-language learners, the amount of language that is spoken with an accent also increases, since ultimate phonetical attainment is difficult to reach (e.g., Muñoz & Singleton, 2010; Granena & Long, 2012). How people use these foreign languages has been a topic of interest for a long time (e.g., Sasaki, 1996). Many studies on second language acquisition and bilingualism have tried to add to the knowledge of language learning and language use (e.g., Granena & Long, 2012).

A more recent addition to the field of research is the influence of speaking a second language on decision making, called the Foreign Language Effect (FLE) (Keysar, Hayakawa & Ann, 2012). This effect is also seen in making moral judgments when faced with moral dilemmas (Costa et al., 2014). This is often called the Moral FLE (MFLE) but sometimes also simply FLE. More specifically, research has shown that when bilinguals have to decide on moral dilemmas in their foreign language, they tend to respond more rationally compared to when the dilemmas are provided in their native language (e.g., Cipolletti, McFarlane & Weissglass, 2016; Corey, Hayakawa, Foucart, Aparici, Botella, Costa & Keysar, 2017; Costa, Foucart, Hayakawa, Aparici, Apestequia, Heafner & Keysar, 2014; Geipel, Hadjichristidis & Surian, 2015b; Hayakawa, Tannenbaum, Costa, Corey & Keysar, 2017). Since the MFLE was recently also found auditorily (Brouwer, 2019, 2020; Muda, Pienkosz, Francis & Biatek, 2020), the present study aims to see if accent can have a similar effect on the decisions on moral dilemmas.

Theoretical background

The classic Footbridge dilemma is a well-attested dilemma within the field of research that looks into moral decision making. In this dilemma, participants are asked if they would save five people that are tied to a trolley track by pushing one man onto the track to stop the trolley (Foot, 1978; Thomson, 1985). In a foreign language, people are more inclined to answer that they would push the man onto the track than they would be in a native language. This effect was only found when the dilemmas were constructed in a personal manner, asking the participant to physically push the man instead of pushing a button for example.

The two options in the dilemma represent two different types of processing. The Dual-Process framework makes a distinction between Type 1 processing (deontological), which is quick,

intuitive, and more emotional in comparison to Type 2 processing (utilitarianism), which is slow, analytic and rational (Kahneman, 2011; Stanovich & West, 2000). The deontological reaction would be to rely on values that prevent people from actively causing harm, and therefore decide that one would not push the man on the track to do no harm. The utilitarian decision, however, would be considering the facts more rational and seeing that pushing the man on the track leads to the least amount of harm overall. The appropriate decision would therefore be that one would push the man on the track to save five others. The difference in responding to a native or foreign language is thought to come from the type of processing used while reading or hearing the dilemmas in that specific language.

While many authors found comparable evidence supporting the MFLE, the conclusions that were drawn from their data differed in explaining the effect. Some stated that the results show that foreign language speakers use less Type 1 processing, and therefore make less deontological decisions (Costa et al., 2014; Hayakawa et al., 2017). Others concluded that the foreign language speakers use more Type 2 processing and therefore make more utilitarian decisions (Cipolletti et al., 2016). Hayakawa et al. (2017) have tried to academically substantiate their claims by testing the deontological and utilitarian accounts separately. They constructed two types of dilemmas: one where the deontological and utilitarianism responses aligned, and one where they did not. By making the two accounts independent of each other, they were able to calculate a deontological score (Type 1 processing) and a utilitarianism score (Type 2 processing) for each participant. The comparison between these scores showed that the participants experienced a decrease of deontological decisions but did not experience an increase in utilitarian decisions. This suggests that the blunted deontological account is the best explanation for the effect.

Most research into the MFLE is done by providing written dilemmas for the participants to read. Recent research, however, shows that the effect is also found when the dilemmas are provided auditorily (Brouwer, 2019, 2020; Muda et al., 2020). Instead of reading the dilemma before responding to the question, the participants were asked to listen to the dilemmas and questions. Audio can convey many details that are left out in the visual experience: additional information from audio such as stress and prosody may provide a richer interpretation (Brouwer, 2020). On top of that, previous research suggests that words can be more emotional when received auditorily compared to visually (Caldwell-Harris & Ayçiçeği-Dinn, 2009; Dewaele, 2004; Harris, Ayçiçeği & Gleason, 2003; Harris, Gleason & Ayçiçeği, 2006). The finding of the auditory MFLE

opens the door to researching the effects that this additional information has on the reception of language. For example, pronunciation is an interesting feature of language that can only be received auditorily but not visually. Most foreign language learners with an age of onset higher than six years old never achieve a pronunciation that is native-like, but continue to have an accent (Granena & Long, 2012). The influence of this accent can now be researched in combination with moral decision making.

Previous work has shown that accent can influence the reception of language in native speakers (Hatzidaki, Baus & Costa, 2015; Lev-Ari & Keysar, 2010; Romero-Rivas et al., 2015). First of all, clear speech has been proven to increase intelligibility (Smiljanić & Bradlow, 2008) while accent can relate to a decrease in intelligibility, which increases the cognitive load because it requires more effort from the listener (Munro & Derwing, 2011). In turn, intelligibility or the ease of processing of stimuli influences stimuli judgements (e.g., Schwarz, 2004; Oppenheimer, 2008). Behavioral research shows that having a foreign accent negatively influences native listener's judgments of the speaker. For example, speakers with an accent are judged to be less credible compared to native speakers, even when making the exact same statements (Lev-Ari & Keysar, 2010). In this study, American English participants judged statements made by a native speaker, a mildly accented speaker, and a heavily accented speaker. In the first experiment the mild accent and the heavy accent showed no difference, but in the second experiment, participants were informed of the bias and were able to correct it for the mild accent but not for the heavy accent. This suggests that the degree of accent also has an influence on processing and the perception of the statement. Additionally, Hatzidaki et al. (2015) found that emotional words were responded to more slowly in a categorizing task than neutral words in both native speech and foreign accented speech by native Spanish listeners. However, in accented speech, there was a noticeable difference between positive and negative words that was absent in native speech. Negative words showed much more significant differences when compared to neutral words than when positive words were compared to neutral words. According to Hatzidaki et al. (2015), this suggests that accented speech is processed differently in the brain than native speech.

A meta-analysis by Fuertes, Gottdiener, Martin, Gilbert & Giles (2012) on the influence of accent on perception has found a negative bias across three distinct areas, namely “status (e.g., intelligence, social class), solidarity (trustworthiness, in-group–out-group-member), and dynamism (level of activity and liveliness)”. They draw the conclusion that speakers with a foreign

accent are likely to face discrimination on the basis of speaking with an accent. A relevant study by Pantos and Perkins (2012) distinguishes between implicit and explicit attitudes towards foreign accented speech. The results show a negative implicit bias against foreign accented speech compared to U.S. accented (native) speech but a positive explicit bias in the same comparison, which is likely caused by the participants' awareness of the negative bias, which leads to hypercorrection.

Altogether, the prior data show a negative influence of foreign accent on the reception of language in native speakers. While the behavioral data generally show a bleak image for foreign accented speakers, the neurological data show a similar pattern.

Recent event-related brain potential (ERP) data have shown that accented speech is processed differently in the brain compared to native sounding speech, especially when considering emotional topics (Hatzidaki et al., 2015; Romero-Rivas, Martin & Costa, 2015). Romero-Rivas and colleagues measured the brain activity of Spanish native speakers who were listening to either foreign-accented speech or native sounding speech, focusing on the P200, N400, and P600 effects. These are positivities (P) or negativities (N) of a certain amplitude (number) that show activity in the brain regions that deal with language processing. The results showed that the brain activity differed in all three effects depending on whether the participants were listening to native or foreign sounding speech, which means that the brain processes the information differently or has difficulty processing it.

In addition to the behavioral data from Hatzidaki et al. (2015), the researchers also looked at ERP data during the experiment. The ERP data supported the behavioral data by showing a difference in amplitude of the P600 effect, which showed a main effect of accent group. Emotion clearly plays a role in processing spoken information. Based on the research into intelligibility, one can argue that accent leads to more attentive listening which can lead to shift to Type 2 processing (Schwarz, 2004; Oppenheimer, 2008; Munro & Derwing, 2011). Regardless, since the source of the foreign language effect is said to be in emotional processing (Type 1), and accent also influences this process, it would be relevant to see if accent can lead to an effect that is similar to the MFLE.

In sum, the two types of processing discussed previously, namely emotional (Type 1) and rational (Type 2), are both affected by accent and can thus influence the results in the morality judgements. One theory suggests a decrease in emotionality which leads to heightened utilitarian

responses (Costa et al., 2014; Hayakawa et al., 2017) and another theory suggests an increase in cognitive load which also leads to heightened utilitarian responses (Cipolletti et al., 2016). Even though the evidence seems to point in the direction of the first theory of the blunted deontological account based on Hayakawa et al. (2017), the discussion is still ongoing.

The current study

The present study aims to use the findings of the auditive MFLE (Brouwer, 2019, 2020; Muda et al., 2020) as a basis to see if the use of accent in the sound fragments elicits a similar effect in moral decision making. Instead of presenting participants with moral dilemmas in a foreign language, they will be presented in their native language, but with a foreign accent. The results could provide a valuable insight in how accented speech is perceived and processed by native speakers, and more specifically how it influences decision making. The study will investigate to what extent Turkish-accented Dutch elicits changes in native Dutch speakers' decision making on moral dilemmas compared to native sounding (or standard) Dutch. Turkish was chosen since Dutch citizens with a Turkish migration background are the largest migrant group in the Netherlands and make up 2.4% of the population (CBS, 2021). Research shows that Turkish-accented Dutch speakers are judged to be of lower status, to be less approachable, and more socially distant than native Dutch speakers (Jongenburger, 2002). On top of that, Turkish and Dutch are very different from each other phonetically as they are from two different language families. Two degrees of accent will be used in the comparison, namely a mild and a strong accent.

While the two theories discussed previously, namely the blunted deontological account (Costa et al., 2014; Hayakawa et al., 2017) and the heightened utilitarianism account (Cipolletti et al., 2015), represent two different possible explanations, they lead to the same hypothesis. Based on previous research, participants that listen to the dilemmas in accented speech are expected to respond more utilitarian compared to participants that listen to the dilemmas in native speech (e.g., Cipolletti et al., 2016; Corey et al., 2017; Costa et al., 2014; Geipel et al., 2015a, 2015b; Hayakawa et al., 2017). This means that they will respond 'yes' more often in the accent condition than in the native condition. Additionally, the effect will be stronger in the strong accent condition than in the mild accent condition (Lev-Ari & Keysar, 2010).

Method

Participants

The participants for this study were 93 (45 men) native Dutch speakers aged eighteen years and older ($M=36.41$, $SD=16.08$). They all had normal or corrected to normal hearing. The participants' educational level varied but showed to be evenly divided across the conditions. None of the participants spoke Turkish as a second language. The participants were randomly assigned to either the native speaker condition or one of the two accent conditions. Each participant gave permission to use their responses for the analysis in the consent form.

Speakers

The speakers used in the experiment were selected after a pretest using a Qualtrics online questionnaire (Qualtrics, Provo, UT). The pretest consisted of six Dutch speakers (four second language speakers with a Turkish L1, and two native Dutch speakers) that were divided into two lists. Speakers recorded sixteen sentences individually in a silent room on smartphones and these fragments were used in the questionnaire. The sentences were self-constructed to be of equal difficulty and length and can be found in Appendix A. In the pre-test, participants were asked to judge the accent of the speakers on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 'no accent' (1) to 'strong accent' (7). The results showed no difference between the two native speakers, three L2 speakers were judged as heavily accented, and one as mildly accented. Since the mildly accented speaker was a woman, women were preferred in the other categories as well. Men were therefore excluded, which led to the selection of the other two speakers. The results for the selected speakers can be found in Table 1 below. The two selected L2 speakers represent a mild accent and a strong accent. An additional native speaker is added for comparison, as a control condition. A one-way ANOVA demonstrated that the speakers were judged to be significantly different ($F(5, 7)=119.14$, $p=0.001$, $\eta p^2=0.80$). As can be seen in Table 1, the native speaker was also judged to have a very mild accent. Qualitative data from the questionnaire made clear that the accent of the native speaker was judged as a regional accent while the other two speakers' accents were judged as foreign.

Table 1

Accent scores (SD between parentheses) on a scale from 1 (no accent) to 7 (strong accent) per speaker in the pretest

Speaker	Accent score (SD)
Strong accent	6.38 (1.14)
Mild accent	4.69 (1.20)
Native speaker	2.05 (1.36)

Materials

The materials consisted of ten dilemmas for the main experiment. Hayakawa et al. (2017) distinguish between dilemmas that have aligning deontological and utilitarian responses and dilemmas in which these are not aligned. To make sure that there actually is a conflict between the two options that forces a morality judgement, this study will adopt the dilemmas where the deontological and utilitarian responses do not align.

The experiment was conducted in Dutch which means that the dilemmas were translated from English to Dutch. Two native speakers of Dutch with a high proficiency of English (C2) translated the dilemmas into Dutch. These translations were then compared and possibly adjusted to create a final translation. The original dilemmas and the translations that were used can be found in Appendix B, but an example can be seen below.

Example: 'Border Crossing'

You are a soldier guarding a border checkpoint between your nation and one troubled by violence and terrorism. You notice a young man in a cheap car approaching the checkpoint with a serious look on his face. You suspect he means to bomb the checkpoint, killing all the soldiers inside. He is quickly approaching your station.

Would you shoot and kill the approaching man?

Procedure

The study is conducted through Qualtrics, which is an online questionnaire program that can be accessed through a computer, tablet, or smartphone (Qualtrics, Provo, UT). The first page of the questionnaire consisted of information on the study and asked for permission to use the information that the participants provided. The next page gave the participants instructions on how to fill in the questionnaire: sit in a quiet room without distractions, use headphones, and take the necessary time for the experiment. The rest of the questionnaire consisted of two components. First, participants were asked to answer a couple of questions regarding their general information and their language background history. Second, participants started with the main experiment. This consisted of listening to an audio fragment stating the dilemma and the corresponding question, and then choosing either 'yes' or 'no' as a response to the question. A positive answer meant that the participant would execute the act in the question (utilitarian response) while a negative answer meant that the participant would not (deontological response). The dilemmas were randomly presented and audio fragments could only be played once. Participants were randomly assigned to a condition and each condition had two versions: one with 'yes' presented on the left and 'no' on the right, and one where the answer options were counterbalanced. This prevented directional favors to interfere with the results. The whole session lasted approximately fifteen minutes.

Design and analysis

SPSS was used for the analysis of the results (IBM Corp). The dependent variable is the number of times that the participants chose the utilitarian option instead of the deontological option when asked whether they would do something, i.e., answer 'yes'. Each speaker was given a score based on the percentage of utilitarian answers that could range between 0 and 100%. The independent variable is the degree of accent of the speaker: no accent (native speaker as control condition), mild accent, and strong accent. This variable was measured between-subjects.

A one-way factorial ANOVA was performed to try to detect if there are any significant ($p < 0.05$) differences between the various degrees of accents. With the use of a Tukey post hoc comparison the conditions were then compared to reveal possible differences between conditions.

Results

Table 2 shows the percentage of utilitarian decisions ordered by speaker. The percentages reflect the times dilemmas were answered with the utilitarian option, i.e., ‘yes’. A score of 58% means that the speaker elicited ‘yes’ as an answer in 58% of the responses. As can be seen in the table, all the percentages are close to 50%. A one-way ANOVA demonstrated no significant difference between the speakers, $F(2, 90)=0.71$, $p=0.493$, $\eta p^2= 0.001$. No post-hoc comparisons were conducted as there was no significant effect.

Table 2

Percent of utilitarian decisions on moral dilemmas ordered by speaker (SD between parentheses)

Speaker	Percentage utilitarian decisions (SD)
Strong accent	58% (0.50)
Mild accent	53% (0.50)
Native speaker	54% (0.50)

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to investigate to what extent Turkish-accented Dutch elicits changes in native Dutch speakers’ decision making on moral dilemmas compared to native sounding (or standard) Dutch. Two accented speakers and one native speaker recorded ten moral dilemmas and represented the three conditions (mild accent, strong accent, and native speaker). 93 Native Dutch participants were asked to respond either ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to the dilemmas, which corresponded to a utilitarian or a deontological decision. Based on previous research, the expectation was that participants would respond more utilitarian in the accented conditions than in the native condition (e.g., Cipolletti et al., 2016; Corey et al., 2017; Costa et al., 2014; Geipel et al., 2015a, 2015b; Hayakawa et al., 2017), and that the strong accent condition would increase the rate of utilitarian decisions even more than the mild accent condition (Lev-Ari & Keysar, 2010).

The main finding of the current study is that the comparison between the three conditions showed no significant differences. This means that the Turkish accent did not influence Dutch native speakers’ decision making in moral dilemmas. The conclusion that can be

drawn here is that accent does not influence moral decision making. Even though accent influences credibility (Lev-Ari & Keysar, 2010) and judgements of status and trustworthiness (Fuertes et al., 2012), it does not influence processing on this level. With regards to the Dual Processing Theory, participants were expected to show a decrease in deontological processing (Type 1) which would have caused the increased utilitarianism. Since there was no increase in utilitarian decisions (Type 2), neither the deontological processing increased, nor the utilitarian processing increased, which suggests that accent does not influence processing with regard to moral decision making.

However, there could have been confounding factors. The following will discuss possible explanations and limitations of the study that could have influenced the results.

One possible explanation for the lack of a significant effect is the type of accent that was used in the experiment. Turkish-Dutch speakers were chosen for the frequency and the less prestigious role of the Turkish language in Dutch society (Jongenburger, 2002). Additionally, Turkish and Dutch are very different languages phonetically which ensures that Dutch with a strong Turkish accent sounds very different from native speaker Dutch. However, Pavlenko (2007) coined a factor that was not taken into consideration here: emotional maturity in the language. Since such a large part of the Dutch society (2.4%) consists of Dutch speakers of Turkish descent (CBS, 2021), it is very well possible that the average Dutch speaker is too familiar with the accent to process it as a foreign accent. If Dutch speakers regularly hear Turkish-accented Dutch in everyday life, it might lose its 'foreign' status. This could explain the fact that no accent effect was found since the MFLE is caused by the use of different types of processing for foreign languages compared to the native language (e.g., Costa et al., 2014; Ciolletti et al., 2016; Hayakawa et al., 2017). In this case, the same type of processing would be used to decipher both native speakers' and accented speakers' statements which would explain why there was no effect of accent.

A second possible explanation lies in the number of dilemmas that were used in the experiment. Each participant responded to the same ten dilemmas which is significantly more than other experiments have used (Brouwer, 2019; Ciolletti et al., 2016; Corey et al., 2017; Costa et al., 2014; Geipel et al., 2015b). These previous studies used only one to four dilemmas, which means that each dilemma has a much stronger influence on the overall outcome and the overall results experience less negative influence of order effects (Wiegmann, Okan & Nagel, 2012).

Wiegman and colleagues state that an ordering effect only takes place if the less agreeable dilemma is answered first, not if the more agreeable dilemma is answered first. The dilemmas in the present study were randomly ordered which means that the dilemmas that were answered first only influenced the rest of the decisions if the first dilemma was one the participant did not agree with, and effect that was not compensated for the other way around. Since the present study used so many dilemmas, this order effect was larger than other studies that used fewer dilemmas. The fact that all the percentages are around 50% hints at chance, but could thus also be the result of an order effect that repressed the deontological decisions in participants that were presented a less agreeable dilemma first.

There are a couple of limitations that could have influenced the results of the study. One limitation of the present study is the fact that it was conducted via an online questionnaire. Each participant filled out the form in their own environment and at their own pace. Even though the questionnaire instructed the participants to wear headphones, to sit in a quiet room and to take their time, there is no way of knowing whether they actually did. It was impossible to control for the circumstances in which the participants did the experiment. Future research could replicate the current study a similar experiment in a lab setting that can be controlled.

A second limitation of the study was the length of each sound fragment. Since the native speaker was much more fluent in the language, their fragments were much shorter than the fragments that were produced by both the accented speakers. This could have influenced the attention span of the participants, as well as facilitate processing because of the extra time to think before the question was heard. A possible solution for future research is to manipulate the speed of the accented speakers' fragments to match that of the native speaker.

In addition to the suggestions that were already mentioned, the present study can also be replicated in a different language. Findings could then be generalized to an accent effect and not be limited to this specific language. Even though no significant accent effect was found here, the study could also be replicated using a larger sample size which might make the differences between the conditions significant.

Conclusion

The present study investigated the influence of a Turkish accent in Dutch on moral decision-making in Dutch native speakers. The experiment consisted of an online questionnaire in

which participants were asked to respond to ten auditive moral dilemmas. Three conditions were compared, namely a strong accent, a mild accent, and a native speaker without an accent. The hypothesis was that participants would choose the utilitarian option more often in the accent conditions than in the native speaker condition, and more often in the strong accent condition than in the mild accent condition. However, no significant effect and thus no difference was found between the conditions. Possible explanations for the lack of effect are the choice of accent and the number of dilemmas that were used in the experiment. The limitations of the study were that it was conducted online and that the audio fragments differed in length between the native speaker conditions and the accented conditions. Future research could recreate the experiment in a more controlled environment, with fragments of equal length, and a larger sample size. Another possibility would be to recreate the experiment using a different language and accent.

References

- Brouwer, S. (2019). The auditory Foreign-Language Effect of moral decision making in highly proficient bilinguals. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(10), 865-878.
- Brouwer, S. (2020). The interplay between emotion and modality in the Foreign-Language effect on moral decision making. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 24(2), 223-230.
- Caldwell-Harris, C., & Ayçiçeği-Dinn, A. (2009). Emotion and lying in a non-native language. *International Journal Of Psychophysiology*, 71(3), 193-204.
- CBS (2021). *Hoeveel mensen met een migratieachtergrond wonen in Nederland?* Retrieved 31 May 2021, from <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/dossier/dossier-asiel-migratie-en-integratie/hoeveel-mensen-met-een-migratieachtergrond-wonen-in-nederland>
- Cipolletti, H., McFarlane, S., & Weissglass, C. (2016). The Moral Foreign-Language Effect. *Philosophical Psychology*, 29(1), 23-40.
- Corey, J.D., Hayakawa, S., Foucart, A., Aparici, M., Botella, J., Costa, A., & Keysar, B., (2017). Our moral choices are foreign to us. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 43, 1109-1128.
- Costa, A., Foucart, A., Hayakawa, S., Aparici, M., Apesteguia, J., Heafner, J., & Keysar, B. (2014). Your Morals Depend on Language. *Plos ONE*, 9(4), e94842.
- Dewaele, J. (2004). The Emotional Force of Swearwords and Taboo Words in the Speech of Multilinguals. *Journal Of Multilingual And Multicultural Development*, 25(2-3), 204-222.
- Foot, P. (1978). *The problem of abortion and the doctrine of the double effect in virtues and vices*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Fuertes, J. N., Gottdiener, W. H., Martin, H., Gilbert, T. C., and Giles, H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the effects of speakers' accents on interpersonal evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 42, 120–133.
- Geipel, J., Hadjichristidis, C., & Surian, L. (2015b). The Foreign Language Effect on Moral Judgment: The Role of Emotions and Norms. *PloS One*, 10(7), e0131529.
- Granena, G., & Long, M. H. (2013). Age of onset, length of residence, language aptitude, and ultimate L2 attainment in three linguistic domains. *Second Language Research*, 29(3), 311-343.

- Harris, C., Ayçiçeği, A., & Gleason, J. (2003). Taboo words and reprimands elicit greater autonomic reactivity in a first language than in a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24(4), 561-579.
- Harris, C., Gleason, J., & Ayçiçeği, A. (2006). When is a first language more emotional? Psycholinguistic evidence from bilinguals. In Pavlenko A(ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression, and representation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 257–284.
- Hatzidaki, A., Baus, C., & Costa, A. (2015). The way you say it, the way I feel it: emotional word processing in accented speech. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(1) 351.
- Hayakawa, S., Costa, A., Foucart, A., & Keysar, B. (2016). Using a Foreign Language Changes Our Choices. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(11), 791–793.
- Hayakawa, S., Tannenbaum, D., Costa, A., Corey, J., & Keysar, B. (2017). Thinking More or Feeling Less? Explaining the Foreign-Language Effect on Moral Judgment. *Psychological Science*, 28(10), 1387-1397.
- Jongenburger, W. (2002). Taal is macht: Over taalattitudes in de multiculturele samenleving. In H. Bennis, G. Extra, P. Muysken & J. Nortier, *Een buurt in beweging: talen en culturen in het Utrechtse Lombok en Transvaal* (pp. 141-154). Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- IBM Corp. Released 2020. *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 27.0*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp
- Keysar, B., Hayakawa, S., & An, S. (2012). The Foreign-Language Effect: Thinking in a Foreign Tongue Reduces Decision Biases. *Psychological Science*, 23(6), 661-668.
- Lev-Ari, S., & Keysar, B. (2010). Why don't we believe non-native speakers? The influence of accent on credibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1093–1096.
- Muda, R., Pieńkosz, D., Francis, K., & Białek, M. (2020). The moral foreign language effect is stable across presentation modalities. *Quarterly Journal Of Experimental Psychology*, 73(11), 1930-1938.
- Muñoz, C., & Singleton, D. (2010). A critical review of age-related research on L2 ultimate attainment. *Language Teaching*, 44(1), 1-35.
- Munro, M., & Derwing, T. (2011). The foundations of accent and intelligibility in pronunciation research. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 316-327.

- Oppenheimer, D. (2008). The secret life of fluency. *Trends In Cognitive Sciences*, 12(6), 237-241.
- Pantos, A. J., and Perkins, A. W. (2013). Measuring implicit and explicit attitudes toward foreign accented speech. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 32(1), 3–20.
- Pavlenko, A. (2017). Do you wish to waive your rights? Affect and decision-making in multilingual speakers. *Current Opinion In Psychology*, 17(1), 74-78.
- Qualtrics. (2005). Provo, UT, USA. <https://www.qualtrics.com>
- Romero-Rivas, C., Martin, C. D., & Costa, A. (2015). Processing changes when listening to foreign-accented speech. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 9(167), 1-15.
- Sasaki, M. (1996). *Second language proficiency, foreign language aptitude and intelligence: quantitative and qualitative analyses*. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.
- Schwarz, N. (2004). Metacognitive Experiences in Consumer Judgment and Decision Making. *Journal Of Consumer Psychology*, 14(4), 332-348.
- Smiljanić, R., & Bradlow, A. (2008). Speaking and Hearing Clearly: Talker and Listener Factors in Speaking Style Changes. *Language And Linguistics Compass*, 3(1), 236-264.
- Thomson, J. J. (1985). The trolley problem. *Yale Law Journal*, 94(6), 1395-1415.
- Wiegmann, A., Okan, Y., & Nagel, J. (2012). Order effects in moral judgment. *Philosophical Psychology*, 25(6), 813-836.

Appendix A: Materials pre-test

Sentence	Speaker					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Als ontbijt neem ik gewoonlijk een koffie met melk.	1	2				
Ik hou ervan om naar het park te gaan als het zonnig is buiten.	1	2				
De kleur van taxi's in New York is geel.	1	2				
Er zitten 365 dagen in een jaar.	1	2				
Ik ga naar het museum dit weekend.			1	2		
In de zomer is er veel regen in India.			1	2		
Parijs is de hoofdstad van Frankrijk.			1	2		
Berlijn is een erg populaire bestemming.			1	2		
Saturnus is een planeet omringd door ringen.					1	2
Kangoeroes kunnen springen, maar olifanten kunnen dat niet.					1	2
In Nederland staan erg veel windmolens.					1	2
Ik kijk graag naar sportwedstrijden op TV.					1	2
De zon gaat in de winter vroeg onder.					2	1
Pluto wordt officieel geen planeet meer genoemd.					2	1
Ik vind het leuk om in de natuur te wandelen.					2	1
Bij het eten kregen we een gratis drankje.					2	1

Note: Number corresponds to list

Appendix B: Dilemma's in English and Dutch

Border Crossing

You are a soldier guarding a border checkpoint between your nation and one troubled by violence and terrorism. You notice a young man in a cheap car approaching the checkpoint with a serious look on his face. You suspect he means to bomb the checkpoint, killing all the soldiers inside. He is quickly approaching your station.

Would you shoot and kill the approaching man?

Grens overgang

Je bent een soldaat die een grenscontrolepost bewaakt tussen jouw land en een land dat wordt geteisterd door geweld en terrorisme. Je ziet een jonge man in een goedkope auto de controlepost naderen met een serieuze blik op zijn gezicht. Je vermoedt dat hij de controlepost wil bombarderen, wat alle soldaten binnen zal doden. Hij nadert jouw station snel.

Zou jij schieten en de naderende man doden?

Animal Research

You have been hired by a medical company to conduct research on their drugs. Since drugs must be safe for humans, they are first tried out on animals. Your job is to find out how various chemicals affect rats, pigeons, rabbits, and monkeys. Most chemicals have only minor effects on the animals, but some cause them pain or even permanent damage. The chemicals you are researching are supposed to be part of a new AIDS drug cocktail that will give new hope to millions of AIDS victims around the world. You anticipate saving many lives with the chemicals.

Would you test these chemicals on animals?

Dierenproeven

Je bent aangenomen door een medisch bedrijf om hun medicatie te onderzoeken. Omdat de medicatie veilig moet zijn voor mensen, wordt het eerst getest op dieren. Het is jouw werk om uit te zoeken hoe verschillende chemicaliën invloed hebben op ratten, duiven, konijnen en apen. De meeste chemicaliën hebben slechts minimaal effect op de dieren, maar sommigen bezorgen hen

pijn of zelfs blijvende schade. De chemicaliën die je onderzoekt zouden onderdeel moeten worden van nieuwe medicatie voor AIDS die nieuwe hoop zal geven aan miljoenen AIDS slachtoffers over de hele wereld. Je verwacht vele levens te redden met de chemicaliën.

Zou jij deze chemicaliën testen op dieren?

Vaccine Policy

You are a doctor in a health clinic full of patients with a serious disease. You just received a shipment of drugs that can cure the disease but the drugs have their own dangerous side effects. If you give the drugs to your patients, a small number will die from the side effects but most will live. If you do not, most will die from the disease.

Would you give the drug to your patients?

Vaccinatie beleid

Je bent een dokter in een kliniek vol met patiënten met een ernstige ziekte. Je hebt zojuist een lading medicijnen ontvangen dat de ziekte kunnen genezen, maar de medicijnen hebben zelf gevaarlijke bijwerkingen. Als je het medicijn aan je patiënten geeft zal een klein deel sterven aan de bijwerkingen maar de meeste zullen overleven. Als je het niet doet, zullen de meesten sterven aan de ziekte.

Zou jij het medicijn aan je patiënten geven?

Torture

You are a police officer, and have recently caught a criminal you have been hunting for some time. He has made many bombs: some that have already exploded and some that have not exploded yet. He places bombs outside cafes and they explode when people are drinking coffee on the patios. He has injured many people and might injure many more. Now that the criminal is caught, you want to know where the unexploded bombs are so you can stop them. He refuses to talk, so you decide to use torture, such as holding his head under water and beating him, until he confesses.

Would you use torture in order to find and stop the unexploded bombs?

Marteling

Je bent een politie agent en je hebt onlangs een crimineel gevangen die je al een tijd zocht. Hij heeft vele bommen gemaakt, sommigen daarvan zijn al ontploft en anderen zijn nog niet ontploft. Hij plaatst de bommen bij cafés en ze ontploffen wanneer mensen koffie drinken op de terrassen. Hij heeft veel mensen verwond en mogelijk verwondt hij er nog veel meer. Nu de crimineel gevangen is wil je weten waar de onontpofte bommen zijn zodat je ze kan ontmantelen. Hij weigert te praten, dus besluit je hem te martelen, zoals zijn hoofd onderwater houden en hem te slaan, totdat hij bekent.

Zou jij marteling gebruiken om de bommen te vinden en te ontmantelen?

Abortion

You are a surgeon. A young woman you know becomes pregnant, but her body reacts in an unusual way. She develops a severe disease that leads to dangerous increases in blood pressure. The only treatment is to deliver the baby. Unless the baby is delivered soon, the mother will die. However, the baby is too young to survive on its own. If the baby is delivered, it will die. So, although the decision is very difficult for her, the mother asks you to abort the baby.

Would you perform an abortion in order to save the mother's life?

Abortus

Je bent chirurg. Een jonge vrouw die je kent raakt zwanger maar haar lichaam reageert op een ongewone manier. Ze ontwikkelt een ernstige ziekte die leidt tot een gevaarlijke toename van de bloeddruk. De enige behandeling is om de baby te baren. Tenzij de baby snel gebaard wordt, zal de moeder overlijden. Echter, de baby is te jong om te overleven buiten de buik. Als de baby gebaard wordt, zal hij sterven. Dus, ondanks dat het een moeilijke beslissing is voor haar, vraagt de moeder je om de baby te aborteren.

Zou jij een abortus uitvoeren om het leven van de moeder te redden?

Relationship

You are divorced now and your former spouse lives far away. You don't expect to see your former spouse for a very long time. However, you have recently started dating a new person that is wonderful. Your new partner is in love for the first time and you feel equally strong about your partner. You want to do everything in your power to keep the relationship moving smoothly. Unfortunately, your new partner has told you many times that dating someone who is divorced is forbidden in your partner's religion. Your partner doesn't know about your ex-spouse. You consider keeping your previous relationship a secret so that your current relationship can continue.

Would you keep your previous relationship a secret in order to keep her/him happy and the relationship alive?

Relatie

Je bent gescheiden en je voormalige echtgenoot woont ver weg. Je gaat er niet vanuit dat je je ex voorlopig weer ziet. Echter, je bent recentelijk een nieuw persoon aan het daten die geweldig is. Je nieuwe partner is voor het eerst verliefd en jij voelt dezelfde mate van liefde voor je partner. Je wilt alles in je macht doen om de relatie soepel te laten verlopen. Helaas heeft je nieuwe partner je vaak verteld dat een relatie hebben met iemand die gescheiden is, strikt verboden is in de religie van je partner. Je partner is niet op de hoogte van je voormalige echtgenoot. Je overweegt om je vorige relatie geheim te houden zodat je huidige relatie verder kan blijven gaan.

Zou jij je vorige relatie geheim houden om hem/haar gelukkig te houden en de relatie te redden?

Crying Baby

It is war time. Enemy soldiers have taken over your village. They have orders to kill all remaining civilians. You and some of your neighbors hide in the cellar of a large house. Outside you hear the voices of soldiers who have come to search the house for valuables. A baby with no parents begins to cry loudly. You cover her mouth to block the sound. If you remove your hand

from the baby's mouth her crying will get the attention of the soldiers who will kill you and the others hiding out in the cellar. To save yourself and the others you must smother the child to death.

Would you smother the child in order to save yourself and the other neighbors from being killed?

Huilende baby

Het is oorlog. Vijandelijke soldaten hebben jouw dorp overgenomen. Ze hebben de opdracht gekregen om alle overige burgers te vermoorden. Jij en een aantal van je buren verstoppen jullie in de kelder van een groot huis. Buiten hoor je de stemmen van soldaten die het huis komen doorzoeken voor waardevolle spullen. Een baby zonder ouders begint hard te huilen. Je bedekt haar mond om het geluid te blokkeren. Als je je hand van de baby's mond weghaalt zal haar gehuil de aandacht van de soldaten trekken en die zullen jou en de anderen in de kelder vermoorden. Om jezelf en de anderen te redden zul je het kind moeten verstikken.

Zou jij het kind verstikken om jezelf en de andere buren te redden van de dood?

Hard Times

You are the head of a poor family in a poor country. Your crops have failed, and it appears that you have no way to feed your family. Your sons are too young to find jobs, but your daughter could do better. You know a man from your village that makes pornographic films with girls such as your daughter. In one year of filming such videos your daughter could earn enough money to keep your family fed for several years.

Would you employ your daughter in the pornography industry in order to feed your family?

Zware tijden

Je bent het hoofd van een arm gezin in een arm land. Je oogst is mislukt, en het ziet er naar uit dat je je gezin niet kunt voeden. Je zonen zijn te jong om werk te zoeken maar je dochter heeft een grotere kans. Je kent een man uit je dorp die pornografische films maakt met meisjes zoals je

dochter. In een jaar zou je dochter genoeg geld kunnen verdienen met het opnemen van zulke video's om je gezin meerdere jaren te voeden.

Zou jij je dochter in de pornografische industrie laten werken om je gezin te voeden?

Car Accident

You are driving through a busy city street when all of a sudden a young mother carrying a child trips and falls in front of your car. You are going too fast to stop in time; your only hope is to move out of the way. Unfortunately, there is a little old lady walking in the only place you can move to. If you move out of the way to avoid the young mother and baby, you will seriously injure or kill the old lady.

Would you move out of the way and hit the old lady in order to avoid the young mother and child?

Auto ongeluk

Je rijdt door een drukke stad wanneer er opeens een jonge moeder met een kind struikelt en voor je auto valt. Je rijdt te snel om op tijd te kunnen stoppen; je enige hoop is om uit te wijken. Helaas loopt er een oud vrouwtje op de enige plek waar je naar uit kan wijken. Als je uitwijkt om de moeder en baby te ontwijken zul je de oude vrouw ernstig verwonden of doden.

Zou jij uitwijken en de oude vrouw raken om de moeder en het kind te ontwijken?

Time Machine

You find a time machine and travel back to the year 1920. While checking into a hotel, you meet a young Austrian artist. You realize this is Adolf Hitler before becoming the leader of the Nazi party. He is staying in the hotel room next to yours and the doors are not locked. It would be easy to kill him and thereby prevent the Second World War and the Holocaust. However, he has not committed any crimes yet and it seems wrong to hurt an innocent person.

Would you kill an innocent young Hitler in order to prevent the Second World War?

Tijdmachine

Je vindt een tijdmachine en reist terug naar het jaar 1920. Terwijl je incheckt in een hotel ontmoet je een jonge Oostenrijkse kunstenaar. Je realiseert je dat het Adolf Hitler is voordat hij de leider van de Nazi Partij werd. Hij verblijft in de hotelkamer naast die van jou en de deuren zijn niet op slot. Het zou gemakkelijk zijn om hem te doden en daarmee de Tweede Wereldoorlog en de Holocaust te voorkomen. Echter, hij heeft nog geen misdaden gepleegd en het lijkt verkeerd om een onschuldig persoon pijn te doen.

Zou jij een onschuldige, jonge Hitler vermoorden om de Tweede Wereldoorlog te voorkomen?